



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,063	09/18/2003	Phil Van Dyke	VP088	7683

20178 7590 08/10/2006

EPSON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT
150 RIVER OAKS PARKWAY, SUITE 225
SAN JOSE, CA 95134

EXAMINER

XU, KEVIN K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2628

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/666,063	Applicant(s) DYKE ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin K. Xu	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 7/10/06 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-14, 28-30 under Ulichney have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Roever. (2003/0007686)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-14, 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulichney (5920322) in view of Roever. (20030007686)

Regarding claim 1, Ulichney teaches identifying a first color space format. (Col 2 lines 3-8, Col 6 lines 1-9) It should be noted that the first color space format as taught by Ulichney is YUV and YUV **must be** identified if the system is to be perform YUV to RGB dematrixing. Furthermore, Ulichney teaches selecting both an offset parameter and a scale parameter associated with the first color space format. (Col 17 lines 1-67, Col 18 lines 45-59, Figs 32, 33A, 34 and 35) It should be noted that the scale parameter as taught by Ulichney is a slope/steepness variable. Additionally Ulichney teaches identifying a conversion matrix configured to convert values associated with the

first color space format to a second color space format. (Col 7, lines 1-14 Fig. 32) It should be noted that the color transform (matrix) as taught by Ulichney is employed by the color conversion system (Fig. 32) and the second color space format as taught by Ulichney is RGB. It should be noted that Ulichney teaches applying the offset parameter and the scale parameter **prior** to application of the conversion matrix for input YUV values. (Col 17 lines 13-31, Fig. 34) It should be noted the table builder performs the function of the conversion matrix with constant values set for the conversion matrix, converting YUV to RGB (Fig. 32, Col 7 line 1- Col 8 line 19). However, Ulichney does not explicitly teach determining *when* to apply the offset parameter and scale parameter in relation to application of the conversion matrix. This is what Roever teaches. (Fig. 1, p. 1 paragraph 6, p. 1 paragraph 13, p. 2 paragraphs 14-15, p. 2 paragraphs 24-25, p. 3 paragraph 30 paragraph 32) It should be noted that Roever teaches the scaler provides both scaling (multiply) and offsetting (add) (p. 2 paragraph 24) and is *optionally* applied (p. 2 paragraph 24 and Fig. 1) after the color space converter. Furthermore, it should be noted the color space converter is configured to employ multiplication and addition components of an FIR filter (e.g. p. 2 paragraph 14) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *optionally* applying offset parameter and scale parameter (determining when) after application of the conversion matrix as taught by Roever into the system of Ulichney because due to throughput constraints, the multiplexer (140a) may be configured such that only one function, color space conversion or image scaling may be applied (e.g. in RGB based

Art Unit: 2628

system, scaling may be provide only for images that are provided from an RGB source, which does not require color-space conversion) (p. 2 paragraph 25) and furthermore, controlling the multiplexer so data from converter and scaler are alternately processed, thereby allowing continuous processing to one input or the other for the entire process. (p. 3 paragraph 25)

Claim 9 is similar in scope to claim 1 except for the recitation of program instructions. Ulichney also teaches this. (Col 17, lines 23-31) Therefore, claim 9 is rejected under similar rationale as claim 1.

Consider claims 2 and 10, Ulichney teaches identifying the first color space format as a YUV based color format and the second color space format as an RGB based color format. (Col 2 lines 3-8, Col 6 lines 1-9) Additionally Ulichney teaches applying the offset parameter and the scale parameter prior to application of the conversion matrix. (Col 17 lines 1-67, Col 18 lines 45-59, Figs 32, 33A, 34 and 35)

Regarding claims 6 and 12, Ulichney teaches adjusting brightness characteristic through a value associated with the offset parameter. (Col 17 lines 5-9)

Regarding claims 7 and 13, Ulichney teaches adjusting color balance through a value associated with the offset parameter. (Col 17 lines 5-9, Col 17 lines 61-66)

Consider claims 8 and 14, Ulichney teaches adjusting a contrast characteristic through a value associated with the scale parameter. (Col 17 lines 5-9, Col 17 lines 42-60)

Regarding claim 3, Ulichney does not explicitly teach identifying the first color space format as an RGB based color format and the second color format as a YUV

Art Unit: 2628

based color format. This is what Roever teaches (p. 1-2 paragraph 13). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to combine the teachings of RGB to YUV color space conversion as taught by Roever into the system of Ulichney because YUV color space monitors human perception of color more closely than RGB for television broadcast. Furthermore, Roever teaches applying the offset parameter and scale parameter after the application of the conversion matrix. (Fig. 1, p. 2 paragraph 24 paragraph 25, p. 3 paragraph 30 paragraph 32) It should be noted that the scaler provides both scaling (multiply) and offsetting (add). (p. 2 paragraph 24) It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to combine the teachings of applying offset parameter and scale parameter after application of the conversion matrix as taught by Roever into the system of Ulichney because the scaler after color space conversion provides the functionality of optional scaling and offsetting (multiply-add) of the image (p. 2 paragraph 24) and thus, a better final color representation can be achieved.

Claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 3 and thus, rejected under similar rationale.

Consider claim 5, Ulichney teaches defining an other offset parameter. (Col 17, lines 1-12) It should be noted the other offset parameter as taught by Ulichney is brightness. However Ulichney does not explicitly teach applying the other offset parameter after the application of the conversion matrix to the values. This is what Roever teaches. (Fig. 1, p. 2 paragraph 24 paragraph 25, p. 3 paragraph 30 paragraph 32) It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the present time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of applying offset parameter after application of the conversion matrix in order to apply the other offset parameter because the scaler after color space conversion provides the functionality of optional scaling and offsetting (multiply-add) of the image (p. 2 paragraph 24) and thus, a better final color representation can be achieved.

Regarding claim 28, Ulichney teaches a display. (Fig. 2) However, Ulichney does not explicitly teach a display controller. Examiner takes official notice of the utilization of a display controller is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to utilize a display controller in order to provide the functionality of allowing the user to regulate and/or adjust settings for a display.

Regarding claim 29, Ulichney does not explicitly teach circuitry. Examiner takes official notice of the utilization of circuitry is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to utilize circuitry in order to convert between color space formats because standardized integrated circuits offer high performance since its small size allows low power logic to be used at fast switching speeds, and thus more efficient performance is achieved.

Consider claim 30, Ulichney teaches a handheld electronic device (camera). (Col 5, lines 27-32) It should be noted that a camera must have an integrated circuit incorporated. However Ulichney does not explicitly teach said handheld electronic device having a LCD display. Examiner takes official notice that handheld electronic devices can have LCD displays. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2628

the present time the invention was made to utilize LCD displays in hand held devices because LCD displays use small amounts of electric power and is therefore, suitable for use in battery-powered electronic devices.

Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulichney (5920322) in view of Roever (20030007686) in further view of Tanaka. (2003/0132906)

Regarding claim 4, Ulichney teaches outputting data associated with RGB based color format. (Fig. 2) However, Ulichney does not explicitly teach manipulating color balance characteristic associated with RGB based color format. This is what Tanaka teaches. (p. 12 paragraph 208) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the present time the invention was made to combine the teachings of manipulating color balance associated with RGB into the system of Ulichney with optional adjustment of offset and scaling of Roever because adjusting gamma correction to maintain color balance of RGB may control a burning of the screen caused by a fixed polarization of liquid crystal or orientation film due to remaining DC voltage that is generated by an unbalance between positive and negative signals (p. 12 paragraph 208) and thus, an improved color representation is achieved.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Kevin K Xu whose telephone number is 571-272-7747. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9 AM – 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2628

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman can be reached on (571)-272-7653.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EB) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

K.X.

Kevin Xu

7/27/2006


ULKA CHAUHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER